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Abstract

This article discusses the relationship between global development and local changes and also analyzes long-term regional development in the Netherlands and Northwest Germany. Spatial patterns of population growth over the period of 1500–2000 are interpreted from a world-systems perspective. Initially, the coastal regions profited from the emerging trade-based agricultural world-system. Later, state formation enabled some of the previously developed regions to regain positions that were formerly lost. A seesaw of development between land and sea-based regions characterized the first two periods of the world-system. An additional seesaw between concentration in national cores and expansion toward the periphery characterizes the last two periods.
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The idea that worldwide developments and specific events are linked is generally accepted in our globalizing world, but how they are linked is less obvious. In the social sciences, there have always been disputes between those looking for general and abstract laws of social development and those focusing on specific events in distinct places. This divergence between ‘lumpers’ and ‘splitters’ characterizes part of the debate on globalization. Spatial metaphors like ‘the world is flat’ or ‘spaces of flows’, contrast with the idea of grounded global relations in places where
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the propinquity or throwntogetherness of different human life paths creates a dynamic multiplicity specific for each place.

Geographers in particular challenge the monolithic whole of globalization, and specifically the paradigm of globalizing spatial relations whose dynamic has only recently transformed authentic places. They oppose the dichotomy between the dynamic global space and timeless places with a clear identity rooted in history. Doreen Massey stresses that globalizing space and specific places are inextricably linked in a grounded connectedness. Space and time are not opposites, but inextricably linked. Space is re-conceptualized as space–time or time–space. Social relations construct space–time, which covers different scales in a locally specific way; space–time expresses the dynamic geographies in which the global is linked to the local but does not determine its trajectory.

This concept of space–time is more a geographical critique of globalization discourses than a concept useable in empirical analysis. The notion of TimeSpaces, a concept formulated by Immanuel Wallerstein as a critique of universalistic claims of modernization, is more useful for analyzing the relationship between global development and local change. Long-term regional development in the Netherlands and Northwest Germany is analyzed in this article, and spatial patterns of population growth over the period 1500–2000 are interpreted from a world-systems perspective.

Wallerstein elaborates on Braudel’s famous distinction between three forms of time. Both stress the fact that the social sciences have been dominated for too long by the search for natural laws of behavior that are irrespective of time and space. Braudel distinguished three different forms of time and opposed the traditional focus of history on the chronicle of events, the événements. He wanted more attention paid to the long-term perspective of the slowly changing structures, the structurelle. The conjoncturelle refers to the intermediate time of cyclical changes, which are intergenerational (about half a century long) repetitions of similar historical processes such as economic expansions and world leadership. This conjoncturelle generates new geographies. Different epochs of economic expansion are comparable within the structurelle, but produce different spatial structures with different networks and different cores. For instance, the dominance of Venice in fifteenth-century European trade was based on its oriental connections. It was later succeeded by Antwerp, whose dominant position was based on the expanding occidental links with the Americas.

Immanuel Wallerstein further refines Braudel’s times, relates them more explicitly with space, and distinguishes between five different TimeSpaces. The first kind, eternal TimeSpace, is characterized by explanations that disregard the specificities of time and space. This search for general
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3 Massey, For Space (note 2), 188.
laws of behavior has dominated the social sciences until recently. They conceptualized social change as eternal progress everywhere in which time and space were theoretically irrelevant, as just a practical obstacle for modernization. Space and time in this Newtonian worldview were only the here and now of observable facts caused by outside forces. The specific place and moment form the episodic TimeSpace and the less scientific humanities disciplines studied these events. For example, history studied time as the events of the past, while geography studied space as unique and separate regions and places.

The world-systems approach criticizes the search for universal laws, but also seeks to go beyond the analysis of particular events and places. It therefore focuses on the TimeSpaces between these two extremes to analyze the relationship between worldwide developments and specific events. The connections between these TimeSpaces are essential for the functioning of the world-system and its development over time and in space.

Each world-system forms structural TimeSpaces, with fundamentally different operating principles and developmental paths. Expanding borders and a developing spatial division of labor which transforms the global environment are spatial aspects of the structural TimeSpace of our capitalist world-system. These structures are quite persistent and change only gradually.

A specific structural TimeSpace defines a world-system; it functions through successive cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces. As its composite name suggests, these are diverse and partly overlapping phenomena which combine cyclical time with ideological space. The world-system functions through cyclical change, which furthers the more linear development of its structural TimeSpace. For instance, the ever present competition between states generates cycles with alternating periods of rivalry and peace, which structurally increase state power over time. Spatial and ideological divisions, like those between East and West during the cold world war and between North and South during decolonization, characterize different cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces. The rise and decline of specific regions and states, under circumstances that differ between period and zone, also shape these TimeSpaces. The different cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces will structure our analysis of the long-term regional development in the Netherlands and Northwest Germany.

The transition from one structural TimeSpace to another constitutes a transformational TimeSpace. These are unique occurrences at the right time and place, when one structural TimeSpace succeeds another; these are the rare moments when free will can determine the future organization of society. For example, the world-system was a new structural TimeSpace that emerged out of the crisis of feudalism in Northwestern Europe. A large scale and expanding division of labor based on market competition replaced a coercion-based local division of labor. The core of northwest Europe profited from trade in agricultural products with eastern Europe (grain and timber) and the Americas (gold, silver and sugar); this enabled their economies to concentrate on highly profitable industries. Development in the peripheries suffered from specialization in agricultural commodities with low profit margins. Relations with northwest Europe also hindered the emergence of an independent class of entrepreneurs and weakened the peripheral states.

Wallerstein places Asia and Africa in this long sixteenth century outside the world-system. Trade with Asia was in luxury goods whose production in Asia and consumption in Europe
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did not significantly influence the functioning of both economies. It was not the world-system but the Chinese empire which determined the terms of trade for silk and porcelain, forcing the Europeans to pay with silver and gold. Some see in these monetary links evidence for a world silver economy, or stress the importance of the profits of the slave trade for British capital formation at the eve of industrialization. Others distinguish a European sub-system within a wider world-system, or even lump the whole of world history into a single world-system.

Our world-system developed within this new structural TimeSpace through several cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces. Wallerstein is not very precise in the timing of these periods, but Joshua Goldstein has analyzed dozens of studies into the long cycles in the world-system, resulting in the following periodization: 1495–1648, 1648–1815, 1815–1945 and 1945–present. The shortening of these cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces reflects the intensification of the pace of change in the structural TimeSpace of the world-system.

After its emergence in the long sixteenth century, stagnation characterized the next cyclico-ideological TimeSpace of the world-system. Production and trade diminished. Although regional self-sufficiency increased and the international division of labor contracted, the capitalist world-economy did not disappear. The many wars in this period, from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, strengthened the core states and institutionalized the interstate system of competing sovereign states. This in turn consolidated the modern world-system and, by integrating their territories into national markets, created the conditions for renewed expansion in the nineteenth century.

A revival in trade marked the beginning of a period of renewed expansion of the world-system which spatially expanded and finally incorporated the entire globe at the end of this period. Europe’s military power opened up Asian economies and imposed favorable terms of trade and the world-system expanded in Africa through colonialism. This spatial expansion went hand in hand with the further intensification of the world-system. Economic specialization matured to such a degree that many characterized it as an industrial revolution. Although agriculture lost its dominant role and the role of wage laborers increased, there was no fundamental break in the functioning of the world-system. The fortunes of different groups and areas within the world-system changed, but the workings of the market-based capitalist world-economy remained the same.
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14. J.S. Goldstein, Long Cycles: Prosperity and War in the Modern Age, London, Yale, 1988. These years do not exactly match the years for which there are data on regional development. However, time in the world-system is not the fixed clock time, but the social time of alternating periods. These can also differ between domains and regions. Assuming that the changing forces in these eras take some time to be regionally absorbed, the periods are extended towards the years for which there are data. The periods 1500–1700, 1700–1850, 1850–1950 and 1950–2000 are the periods for which regional development is analyzed.
After its glorious nineteenth century, the world-system entered into a more challenging period. Economic stagnations and World Wars marked the beginning of a new cyclico-ideological Time-Space of our world-system. The spatial division of labor changed and the European core states lost their dominant position to new core states. The center of the world-system shifted further westward. The USA, and later Japan, overtook the western European economies while socialist revolutions and decolonization undermined the political dominance of the core states. However, the loosening of privileged links between individual core states and peripheries strengthened economic integration of the world-system. More recent globalization further intensified integration and spread development toward some parts of the former periphery in Asia.

Studying regional development within the world-system

In principle, this world-systems approach is very suitable for studying the linkage between worldwide developments and specific events. However, in practice, it hardly penetrates below the state level. Although it began as a critique of state-centered developmentalist thinking of modernization theory, states still dominate in Wallerstein’s voluminous analysis of our changing world-system. When the regional level comes into focus on occasion, it is to explain the development of states. For instance, Wallerstein compares French and British regional structure to explain why the British state triumphed in the second cyclico-ideological TimeSpace of the world-system.\textsuperscript{16} For some, this is a fundamental problem in the conceptualization of space in the world-systems approach. ‘Wallerstein’s conception of global space is thus most precisely described as an \textit{inter-state} division of labor: national state territoriality serves as the basic geographical unit of the world economy’.\textsuperscript{17} However, it can also be seen as an empirical deficiency. The state level still predominates in academic studies and the availability of statistics limits the analysis of worldwide quantitative data for the more recent past and on the state level.\textsuperscript{18}

The long-term development of individual regions is also frequently studied from a world-systems perspective. For instance, Stephen Hanna analyzed how, over the centuries, the improving position of the USA in the world-system influenced the regional development of a national peripheral region.\textsuperscript{19} Space then is almost reduced to a place. The relationship with higher scales dominates the analysis and the spatial context of similar regions receives little attention. Another line of research studies how patterns of regional inequality are created by worldwide developments.

It is very difficult to do justice to all the complications of TimeSpaces in empirical research from a world-systems perspective. The complexity of time scales means that space must be reduced. Using population size as a rough indicator of regional development and reducing the study


area, this article tries to overcome some of the problems in analyzing the relationship between regional change and worldwide developments.

Population size is the most useful indicator for comparing regional development over such a long period. Braudel suggests that ‘it is in the end the most reliable of registers for measuring the forces at work in history’; indeed, it ‘provides an index of success and failure’. Wallerstein also uses population growth and decline to indicate the differences between the different cyclo-ideological TimeSpaces and the rise or decline of the position of individual states in the world-system. ‘The traditional correlate of economic expansion (both its evidence and its consequence) is a population upsurge’.

The regional level is more suited to study economic transformations than the national level. The aggregates of the nation-state hide regional differentiation and blunt the strong regional dynamics in specific regions. Structural transformations like industrialization occur at the regional level. The particular physical environment, political regimes, social structures, demography and culture provide the causes why specific regions transform and become more competitive on external markets. The changing world-system not flattens the world, but makes regions more distinct and strengthens their regional identity. The national aggregated data hide these diverse regional adaptations to the changing world-system. National data mask the dynamic nature and the foundation of these transformations in specific regional conditions. Demographic change is an element of these economic transformations, but there is no uniform relation between demographic and economic changes. Demographic change depends on very specific small-scale processes which differ between regions. Sometimes population pressures drive structural change, in other cases the population increases after industrialization through migration. Despite the important regional differences in the causal relation between population dynamics and economic change, the correlation between them is strong, especially in the long run. Using longer periods evens out the shorter term and regionally specific leads and lags in the relation between demographic and economic change. Population development is therefore a useful indicator for making long-term comparisons of regional development.


24 Wallerstein, The Modern World-System III (note 13), 60.

Census data on regional populations go back to the middle of the nineteenth century; before then, there is only comparable data on urban populations. Urban development is a good indicator of regional development. As the crossroads of both small- and large-scale interaction, cities reflect the regions’ internal and external capacity for development, and as such, cities are important nodes in the world-system. The differences in development between cities reflect the wider patterns of changing regional developments within the world-system. Whereas city size and importance in wider networks do not necessarily coincide, population change is the best indicator of the development of the position and economic prosperity of a town. Cities are also less transitory than regions, and are the most important building blocks from which regions are constructed. The figures for the urban population of regions since 1500 were calculated using Bairoch’s database.

Limiting the study area also facilitates the study of long-term regional development in the world-system. The Netherlands and Northwest Germany together constitute a very suitable study area. From the very beginning, it belonged to the world-system. Grain from the German part made growth of the trade cities of Holland possible, but migration was also important. In the first half of the seventeenth century, 39% of marriage partners in Amsterdam were born abroad. About half of the foreign-born marriage partners in Amsterdam came from our study area. It is also an area with important seasonal migration. Until the nineteenth century, seasonal labor in the Netherlands was an important source of income for many peripheral German regions.

This area is also interesting because developments on both sides of the border show almost opposite trends. In 1300, both had comparable levels of urban densities. In 1700, the density in Germany hardly
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26 Data on urban population is quite scarce and quite fragmentary in the early modern era in this area. See: H. Diederiks, Amsterdam 1600–1800: Demographische Entwicklung und Migration, in: W. Ehbrecht, H. Schilling (Eds), Niederlande und Nordwestdeutschland: Studien zur Regional- und Stadtgeschichte Nordwestkontinentaleuropas im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit, Köln, 1983, 328. Data on urban population is based on P. Bairoch, J. Batou and P. Chèvre, The Population of European Cities: Data Bank and Short Summary of Results, Genève, 1988, the most comprehensive data set and urban population in Europe. This database covers much more cities than for instance J. de Vries, European Urbanization: 1500–1800, Boston, 1984. Calculations are based on contemporary borders. Urban density is the number of people living in urban settlements per square kilometer. Urban settlements are those with more than 3000 inhabitants, as reported in Bairoch, The Population of European Cities (note 26).


29 H. van der Wee, Industrial dynamics and the process of urbanization and de-urbanization in the Low Countries from the late Middle Ages to the eighteenth century: a synthesis, in: H. van der Wee (Ed), The Rise and Decline of Urban Industries in Italy and in the Low Countries, Leuven, 1988, 308–309.

30 Bairoch, The Population of European Cities (note 26).

31 Diederiks, Niederlande und Nordwestdeutschland (note 26), 330, 338.

changed, while in the Netherlands it increased ninefold. The Dutch seventeenth century rise to hegemony contrasts with Germany’s decline. Later, Germany’s position improved in the industrial era, while that of the Netherlands declined. Now, these huge differences of the past have mostly disappeared.

The study area has a distinct regional structure and three national cores dominate (Fig. 1). Furthermore, the area between them is not a homogeneous peripheral space. In the South, there is a zone with very fertile loess soil which includes old cities such as Osnabruck, Hannover, and Braunschweig. Similarly, the coastal zone in the west and north profited from its sea trade possibilities and fertile clay soil. The more developed sea-based zone in the north and the land-based zone in the south are separated by a frugal zone. In this traditionally sparsely populated peripheral zone, infertile sandy soils dominate. Through this, the Weser connects the sea-based zone with the land-based zone in the south. This regional differentiation from the coast in the west and north to the interior in the south and east makes it an interesting area for studying regional development in the different phases of the world-system. The stronger coastal and interior regions are not only separated by a frugal sandy zone, but are also divided by the border between the Netherlands and Germany and show very different paths of development within the world-system.

The selection of units to measure regional development within this zone is not so obvious. Regions are not lasting entities, but are constantly created and destroyed. Regional development is not only a characteristic of a region, but it also creates regions. It is most practical to start from the present administrative division and it is impractical to study the many hundreds of municipalities in the study area. The first meaningful regional levels above municipalities are provinces for the Netherlands and districts (‘Landkreise’) in Germany. The exclusion of large German cities from this administrative framework creates problems for analyzing regional differentiation. Large cities and rural regions are not comparable units for studying regional development and the allocation of the population of these self-governing cities to its neighboring regions tries to alleviate this problem. Lines from the edges of the common border to the center of the city delimit the parts of the territory of the self-governing cities that are allocated to its neighboring regions. Proportional to the size of the divided area, the urban population is divided over its neighboring regions. The population of the Randstad and the Ruhr area are aggregated.

33 See (note 20).
34 See for an elaborate discussion of these concepts: E.W. Fox, History in Geographic Perspective: The Other France, New York, 1971.
36 At this level Dutch regional borders are quite constant. In Germany these regional borders have greatly changed. For Niedersachsen the reconstructed data are available: see Bevölkerung der Gemeinden 1821 bis 1993, Hannover, 1995. For Nord-Rhein-Westfalen these had to be recalculated from S. Reekers, Westfalens Bevölkerung 1818–1955, Münster, 1956. The population figures for the old Kreise in Westfalen were transformed into the present Kreise. Old municipalities were usually in their entirety transferred to the new Kreise. The instances in which the municipal borders were redrawn never involved more than a few percentages of the area of the Kreise. As these are mostly sparsely inhabited areas outside villages, the error for population figures is much lower. Data on the Dutch provinces were based on B.R. Mitchell, European Historical Statistics 1750–1975, London, 1980; and the Regional Statistics, Voorburg. The data on the national core regions is the sum of the provinces South Holland, North Holland and Utrecht for the Randstad: see Statistisches Jahrbuch, Hamburg. Data on the Ruhr area refer to the territory of the Kommunalverband Ruhrgebiet: see H.G. Steinberg, Bevölkerungsentwicklung des Ruhrgebietes im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Düsseldorf, 1978; H.G. Steinberg, Das Ruhrgebiet im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: ein Verdichtungsraum im Wandel, Münster, 1985.
The emerging world-system: 1500–1700

This section starts by discussing how the new structural TimeSpace of the emerging world-system disrupted the medieval regional structure and created new conditions for development, changing the fortunes of individual cities and regions. This section ends with the regional consequences of Dutch hegemony in this cyclico-ideological TimeSpace. Fig. 2 shows the changes in urban population for the regions in the Netherlands and northwest Germany during the period when the modern world-system emerged. The forces operating in this phase of the world-system explain the general pattern of regional development.

The modern world-system did not create cities or trade and regional inequalities. These are features of the eternal TimeSpace that exist in different forms in different structural
TimeSpaces. In Mediaeval Europe, regional diversity depended on the locally different ecological possibilities for subsistence farming; political power was local and based on forced surplus extraction. Urban associations regulated crafts and trade. The capitalist world-system transformed these aspects of the structural TimeSpace of ‘feudal’ Europe. The inert old core areas suffered from this transformation to another structural TimeSpace, while many more marginal regions\textsuperscript{38} could better adapt to the requirements of the capitalist

\textsuperscript{37} This map depicts population growth in percentages based on the population of all selected cities. Figs. 2 and 3 are based on urban population. Figs. 4 and 5 show the development of regional population. In order to enable comparisons between the pattern of regional development in the different periods, the same classification procedure of regional development is used. The stable regions have an average growth. (Half a standard deviation on both sides of the mean of the regions without emerging and depopulating or deserting cities and without adjacent national cores). The rising regions grow more than half a standard deviation above the average. Their position relative to other regions has clearly improved. The emerging regions are those rising regions which had before no urban population. The stagnating regions grow less than half a standard deviation below the average. The declining regions are those stagnating regions whose population decreased. Deserting regions are those regions that lost urban population in the period 1500–1700.

\textsuperscript{38} S. Pollard, \textit{Marginal Europe: The Contribution of Marginal Lands since the Middle Ages}, Oxford, 1997.
world-system. ‘(C)hange can be shown to have frequently erupted around the edge of established systems at all scales’.  

The most prosperous regions in the Middle Ages declined. The urban population diminished in this zone despite fertile loess soils stretching from the Ruhr area to Braunschweig, and it was devastated in the Thirty Years’ War. While this was an important stage in the development toward modern sovereign states elsewhere in Europe, it caused widespread destruction and political disruptions in this area. Combined with the shift from land to the Dutch-dominated sea transport, it even caused the collapse of some of these towns. Destruction of buildings, depopulation, and desertion by long distance traders reduced towns like Hildesheim, Siegen, and Einbeck for a long time to agricultural settlements within the old city walls.

The emergence of the capitalist world-system changed the trade regime. Regional development between 1500 and 1700 reflects the demise of the Hanseatic League, which previously regulated the trade in our study area. In general, the towns that had belonged to the Hanseatic League declined but a few old Hanseatic towns like Hamburg and Bremen prospered. Maritime shipping was an important structuring element of the emerging world-system; it gave opportunities to some, but not all seaports were to develop. Which seaport flourished depended also on other factors at different scales, ranging from local history to political affiliations and location.

Lübeck was the most important city in the Hanseatic League and Hamburg was then its outport to the North Sea. It was the emerging world-system which turned the tables and reduced Lübeck to Hamburg’s outport to the Baltic. Hamburg profited from the revolt in the Low Countries at the end of the sixteenth century and benefited from the influx of merchants and workers; after the fall of Antwerp in 1585, they formed a quarter of its population. In 1500, Hamburg had the same population (15,000) as Amsterdam. Both doubled their population in the sixteenth century due to refugees and the developing North Sea trade. Their regional context was quite different, however. Amsterdam was part of a developing regional urban network spreading across Holland, which it increasingly dominated. Hamburg was isolated and its development mirrored the disintegration around it as it was an important refuge for Germans fleeing the destructions of the Thirty Years’ War. In the seventeenth century, the population growth of Amsterdam accelerated from 54,000 to 200,000, while the growth of Hamburg slowed from 40,000 to 70,000. Therefore, Hamburg became a subordinate node in the Amsterdam-centered trade network.

This dominance of the Dutch in the emerging world-system was the result of successful resistance of Dutch merchants to attempts by the Habsburgs to centralize political control and create a world-empire. Their defeat gave room for the emerging world-system to develop, and gave the Dutch hegemony in the beginning of the seventeenth century. The regional development in our study area reflects this. The Dutch core and the neighboring coastal regions of Friesland and Zeeland developed strongly in this period while the rest of the Netherlands lagged in development.
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Many old Hanseatic inland river towns like Kampen, Deventer, Nijmegen, and Zutphen lost population. This was part of a wider von Thünen-like division of labor focusing on the Amsterdam market. Accessibility to the Amsterdam market depended not only on distance, but also on water transport. In Germany, the Dutch-centered division of labor integrated the regions along the Weser and the Leine as wheat export zones.

Regions without urban populations were not unaffected by the new spatial division of labor in the world-system. This was not just a zoning of land use, but also a spatial division of labor of interrelated social classes in different zones. Some agriculturally unproductive regions became labor pools for nearby commercial agricultural regions and developing cities since the seventeenth century. The Hümmeling in Emsland was one of those regions in the western part of the frugal zone which was characterized by seasonal labor migration. The agriculture in these regions was unimportant for the functioning of the world-system. This area’s role in the world-system was based on a population of cheap labor as semi-proletarians. Their too meager subsistence farming forced them to sell their labor cheaply, but they could survive on lower wages than the more fully proletarianized urban labor force because they had other sources of food through their subsistence farming. This was the basis for both seasonal labor migration and a home industry.

Political expediency, as well as economic profitability, supported the development of some German regions. The Dutch protected their borders with allies. At the North Sea coast, Emden even had a Dutch garrison. Part of the Ruhr area belonged to Kleve, which was for some time controlled by the Dutch and later taken over by the Dutch ally Brandenburg (Prussia).

The emerging world-system explains the regional development in this period. Its economy was based on the growing trade of agricultural products that favored coastal regions. Politically secured by the defeat of the Habsburgs ambitions to transform it into a world-empire, the world-system developed and enabled the Dutch to achieve hegemony, which shaped the regional development in this period.

**Stagnation and consolidation: 1700–1850**

The pattern of regional development shown in Fig. 3 is largely the mirror image of the previous period. Loss of hegemony resulted in stagnation and decline, especially in the sea-based regions in the Netherlands. In contrast, Germany gradually recovered from the destruction of the Thirty Years’ War. Many old Hanseatic towns, depopulated in the previous period, became once again urban centers. This did not signal a return to the previous feudal structural TimeSpace as the world-system did not collapse, but, on the contrary, consolidated in a new cyclico-ideological TimeSpace. The emergence of strong and competing territorial states characterizes this period. Their rivalry fuelled the development of market forces outside the control of individual states. The

---


47 Lucassen, *Naar de Kusten van de Noordzee* (note 32).

international division of labor of the world-system regulated the production of the resources states need to compete. Successful states improved their position in the world-system by applying the operating principles of this structural TimeSpace to new fields. Successful states increased their economic control over their territories in their pursuit for resources to compete with other states. Their rivalry limited the scope of their success, but helped in the creation of national markets. This further institutionalized the world-system and changed the pattern of regional development.

The Dutch Republic, based on an urban alliance of merchants, had been effective in the struggle against the imperial ambitions of the Habsburgers. The treaty of Westphalia of 1648 formalized the Dutch victory over the Habsburgs, and was an important milestone in Europe-wide development toward the modern state based on territorial sovereignty. This signaled the transition from the cyclico-ideological TimeSpace of the emerging system to the consolidating world-system. Initially, this helped Dutch hegemony, but already in the late seventeenth century, the Dutch state lost out to the larger territorial states of France and the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{49} The Dutch Republic based its state formation on the wealth of its merchants. When the agriculturally based international division of labor stagnated and interstate rivalry intensified, the Dutch state lost out to states with more resources. Large territorial states performed better in this cyclico-ideological

\textsuperscript{49} Wallerstein, \textit{The Modern World-System I} (note 13); Wallerstein, \textit{The Modern World-System II} (note 13).
TimeSpace with economic stagnation and increased rivalry. By increasing their control from the center, they not only extracted additional resources from their large territory through coercion, but also created a large national market, which gave new spaces for capitalist development.\textsuperscript{50} The world-system further evolved in this new cyclico-ideological TimeSpace and changed fortunes for different regions. In it, the Dutch regions suffered from their inadequate state. The new arrangement especially favored France and the United Kingdom, but German regions also profited. The pattern in Fig. 3 of stagnating coastal regions and the rise of many inland regions in Germany reflects these changes.

Although Germany was late in developing a united territorial state, the general political situation in Germany improved during this period. German states like Hannover, Oldenburg, and Prussia became more effective, expanded their territories, and later on increased their economic cooperation. This development toward German unity helped the regional development of all German regions, but Prussian territories profited the most. Prussia’s rise was an essential element in this integration process and the territories under its control profited from the expanding modern Prussian state that needed and helped economic development. This contrasted with neighboring German territories, which generally had a more conservative and anti-industrial agricultural regime based on landed gentry.\textsuperscript{51}

The establishment of British hegemony in the world-system during this period also helped Prussia’s rise. The Napoleonic era showed the vulnerability of the sea-based British hegemony to a strong land-based power on the continent. The British allowed Prussia to expand its territories along the Rhine to counterbalance France.\textsuperscript{52} Even though Prussia only acquired the whole of the Ruhr area and its surrounding regions after the Vienna Congress of 1815, Prussia dominated this area beforehand. Most other regional development in Germany in this period was linked to the growing capitals of the larger German states like Hannover, Oldenburg, and Braunschweig.

The economic stagnation throughout the world-system shaped the regional development during this period. The sea-based regions lost ground to the land-based regions that profited more from the growth of territorial states and national markets.

Expansion, industrialization and concentration: 1850–1950

In this cyclico-ideological TimeSpace, the world-system expanded again into new territories, making it the first global structural TimeSpace by eliminating all other structural TimeSpaces and giving it an aura of an eternal TimeSpace (Fig. 4). It expanded not only into new territories, but also, market forces controlled new parts of society.\textsuperscript{53} Industrialization shaped regional development in this period. The growth in the Ruhr area dominated the regional development in the study area and Prussian-sponsored industrialization in an integrating Germany made this an


\textsuperscript{53} Wallerstein, \textit{The Modern World-System III} (note 13).
important core region in the world-system. Prussian-led German unification also helped the rise of other German regions with favorable conditions for development in this period.

British hegemonic decline and growing rivalry in the international political system enabled Prussia to integrate Germany. The Prussians transformed the British-pioneered industrial development. The interventionist Prussian state sponsored close linkages between banking and industry, supported large-scale industrialization, and transformed the previously marginal Ruhr area into an integrated industrial region. Not only did coal mining and the steel industry link up, but the steel industry also became functionally integrated with the machine building and chemical industries.55

The pattern of regional development in this period is dominated by a few large areas. Economies of scale were an important factor behind this concentration of development in a few cores. Although the Ruhr area dominated, Prussian-lead German unification also supported development in other urbanized regions, especially in the eastern part of our study area which includes

the heartland of the kingdom of Hannover, conquered by Prussia in 1866. This dislodged the conservative land-based regime with the modern expansionist Prussian administration. Annexation by Prussia also freed Hannover from the burdens of a small German state and opened up a wider national market in which they had a central location. Hamburg, the other national core in the study area, experienced strong growth. With its good harbor and connections to the hinterland, it profited from the integration of the German national market and its urban mass also attracted industrialization. Bremen’s development was similar, but fainter. It was not only smaller, but its shallow harbor forced it to create a new harbor at the coast in Bremerhaven. Together with the other new Prussian navy port of Wilhelmshaven, this dispersed the regional development over the Weser estuary.

In sharp contrast to Germany, the position of the Netherlands in the world-system hardly improved in this period. The coastal regions especially continued to stagnate, with the important exception of the Randstad. The development of Rotterdam as the transit port for the Ruhr area helped the revival of this national core while the industrialization processes of this cyclico-ideological TimeSpace focused on the national cores, separated by a broad zone of stagnating and stable regions.

Consolidation, convergence and globalization: 1950–2000

The pattern of regional development in the period of 1950–2000 is roughly the opposite of that in the previous period. The spread of development contrasts with the previous concentrated industrialization. In this cyclico-ideological TimeSpace, convergence consolidates the previous surge in development of the world-system. This spread of development takes place on different scales. The Dutch state re-entered the core after centuries of stagnation. In Europe, this semi-peripheral development later spread to states like Italy and Spain. Many other former peripheral and semi-peripheral states improved their position in the world-system during this cyclico-ideological TimeSpace. As globalization, it now threatens the competitiveness of the industries in the old core states.

This spread of development from the core to (semi-)periphery also characterizes regional development at the sub-national state level. The rise of the border regions, shown in Fig. 5, reflects the changing role of the German and Dutch states in regional development. At the regional scale, the influence of the nation-state clearly diminishes in the unifying Europe. The border has lost its negative influence on regional development within the European Union. In the previous cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces, states focused on increasing their hold over national territory. In this period, political institutionalization focuses on other scales. The political standoff between east and west divided Germany and hampered the regional development of the eastern part of our study area while further economic integration of the world-system gave developmental opportunities to new regions. Technological innovations, as well as diminishing transportation and communication costs, enabled companies to become more footloose. This gave opportunities to new locations outside the national cores. The problems accompanying development accumulating in the cores

---

make them less attractive for housing and businesses. To sustain growth, the increasingly inflexible cores need expansion into periphery. The inertia in the core generates an outward search for flexibility. Fig. 5 shows that in the last decades, many regions close to urbanized cores rose. However, development does not necessarily spread to all surrounding regions. Intrinsic qualities of a region, such as landscape, settlement structure, and social climate, increasingly determine the developmental potential of regions. The calculable production potential of a region has lost much ground to perceived consumption possibilities. Agriculture no longer dominates rural economies, but indirectly influences the quality and intensity of subsequent regional development. The idyllic landscapes it has produced can make it very amenable for new developments. The traditionally less well off agricultural regions with infertile sandy soils have diverse small-scale landscapes, free space, low land prices, and a social structure more open to new developments. On the other hand, a long history of intensive commercial agriculture produces unattractive and monotonous large-scale landscapes. Areas with fertile clay soils along the coast, and with loess soils at the feet of the more mountainous areas in the southeast, have developed on this basis in the past. These specialized large-scale production landscapes nowadays contradict the imagery.

Fig. 5. Regional development, 1950–2000: Dutch provinces and German districts.
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of an original landscape that suits the leisure and identification needs of the new middle classes. Consequently, this layer of previous development hinders future developments.\textsuperscript{58}

The spread of development, characteristic of this cyclico-ideological TimeSpace, takes place in different forms and at different scales. This gives new opportunities to previously underdeveloped regions whose success, however, still partly depends on historically formed characteristics.

**Conclusion**

The development of the world-system and regional development are linked. The emergence of the world-system in the first cyclico-ideological TimeSpace benefited sea-based regions and those protected by the successful Dutch state while most traditionally developed regions suffered. The stagnation in the subsequent phase helped the development of territorial states, which consolidated the world-system. The creation of national markets also cleared the ground for later industrialization. The old land-based regions rose again, while the sea-based regions stagnated. Particularly, regions around the capital cities of the developing territorial states grew during this period. A seesaw of development between land and sea-based regions characterized the first two cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces of the world-system. Additionally, a seesaw between concentration in national cores and expansion toward the periphery characterizes the last two periods. In the nineteenth century, a few core zones profited from the renewed expansion of the world-system and the maturation of states into nation states. The rural periphery near the national border especially suffered. Globalization and the spread of regional development between and within states have now replaced the linked process of industrialization and nation-state formation. Within the same structural TimeSpace of the world-system, the regional scale favorable to regional development has changed once again. European integration and globalization has reduced the importance of national borders. Border regions close to the traditional cores and amenable to suburban development have profited especially. The pattern of regional development in the most recent period is less clear than in the previous cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces. This suggests the increased relevance of analyzing specific regions for understanding the regional development in the world-system.

This article demonstrated that the world-systems approach, and especially the differentiation between cyclico-ideological TimeSpaces, is suitable for analyzing long-term regional development. It suggests that globalization is not a recent phenomenon, nor is globalization just the end phase of a gradually increasing spatial interrelatedness. There are clear phases with very distinct patterns of regional development. Neither the development of the world-system since the sixteenth century, nor the more recent globalization, homogenizes space; new patterns of regional differentiation emerge periodically. TimeSpaces of the world-systems approach are useful for understanding these, but must also incorporate the more specific analysis of space–time.